



February 22, 2010

To the members of the labor committee;

Please do not pander to the few people who mistakenly think they would benefit from mandatory paid sick leave and force more jobs out of Connecticut. This would be an added expense for each person we employ. Margins are slim, companies can't afford to cut people, so they will take money away from other things, like benefits, or raises. As you are well aware, the cost per employee is a formula and at the end of the day the only way employers will be able to afford this is to cut the budget somewhere else.

Who is this bill targeting to help? The articles frequently say "do you want a sick person to make your sandwich". No, but I expect a reputable business to manage their people and not allow very sick people to serve me food. If someone has a cold and is working in food service I expect them to do like everyone else and wash their hands and follow other hygiene laws. But ask the employer what their margin is, what the cost per employee is, and how will they pay for the extra person they need to cover for all this mandated sick time. Are you willing to pay an extra \$1 for every sandwich to cover that cost? If not, then are you willing to pay the unemployment expenses of all those people who used to be employed making sandwiches, but the shop closed because it was too expensive to do business in Connecticut.

I work for IPC and we have locations in over 6 states. I recently drafted the employee Handbook for all of North America. Many states required a one page amendment to go over state specific policies, in response to state legislation. Connecticut will be comparable to California in state specific laws that make it hard to business there if we add any more burdensome policies business must follow. When a company looks at adding jobs and they have locations all over the country, this will be one more reason NOT to choose Connecticut.

Respectfully,

Karen Maines
Human Resources Manager
IPC